Appln. No. 10/674,170

Attorney Docket No. 11864-004

III. Remarks

Reconsideration and reexamination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested.

After entering this amendment, Claims 1-7 and 19-30 remain per ding.

Allowable Subject Matter

The undersigned gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of the allowability of Claims 8 and 10-18, if rewritten into independent form, including all the limitation of any base claims. Accordingly, Claims 8, 10 and 14 are being represented in independent form, respectfully as Claims 21, 22 and 30. Also, the dependent Claims 11-18 of Claim 10 have been amended accordingly as Claim 23-29 respectively. Finally, the claims of the present application have been amended with the intention of presenting the claims using language as understandable as possible while preserving the scope of the previous claims.

In view of the above, it is submitted that these claims are allowable and such action is requested.

Amendments to the Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification because of the use the trademark DUROPLAST. As shown previously, the specification has been amended to obviate the Examiner's objection.



Appln. No. 10/674,170

Attorney Docket No. 11864-004

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which application regards as the invention.

Specifically, the Examiner rejected to the broad range or limitation together with the narrow range or limitation in Claim 1 as well as the phrase "motor connection section" as being vague and indefinite. Claim 1 as been amended to remove the broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation and the phrase "motor connection section" has been replaced with the phrase "motor carrier connecting section" throughout the claims. Accordingly, it is believed that this rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

Further Claim Clarifications

Prior to discussing the prior art references, it is believed that a brief discussion on the current form of independent Claim 1 of this application is warranted. The original independent Claim 1 of this application has been amended to clarify, more particularly to point out and distinctly claim that which the applicant regards as the subject matter of the present invention. Specifically, Claim 1 now recites that spring clamps having a latching section, the spring clamps engaging over the motor carrier connecting section in the radial and axial directions relative to the stator axis of rotation in order to abut against the associated elastic element and is latched with the latching section at the other end of the motor carrier connecting section.



Appin. No. 10/674,170

Attorney Dock∈t No. 11864-004

Furthermore, the claims of the present application have been amended to make the claims more clear in their meaning.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a)

Claims 1-7, 14 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by either European Patent 848 477 to Hartmann, United Kingdom Patent Application GB 2258766 to Bosch or United States Patent 6,099,948 to Boucheret. As described previously, Claim 1 has been amended to recite spring clamps engaging over the motor carrier connecting section in the radial and ax all directions in order to abut against the associated elastic element and is latched with a latching section at the other end to the motor carrier connecting section. None of the above mentioned references disclose the additional elements added to Claim 1

Claims 9 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmann in view of German Patent 4401397 to Sturm or Hartmann in view of Japanese Patent 2001-54253 to Takakura, respectively. Claim 1 has been amended to recite spring clamps engaging over the motor carrier connecting section in the radial and axial sections in order to abut against the associated elastic element and is latched with a latching section at the other end to the motor carrier connecting section. None of the before mentioned references or combination thereof disclose the additional element added to Claim 1.

The remaining Claims 2-7, 19 and 20 depend on Claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons given above.



Appin. No. 10/674,170

Attorney Docket No. 11864-004

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentable distinguishable over the art of record and this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

8-25-05 Date Respectfully submitted,

Steven L. Oberholtzer, Esq.

(Reg. No.30,670)